



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

dean Art" by Dr. Reber, which is to be continued in the next number. Probably the most important article is that of Dr. F. Peiser, and certainly the most amusing that of Prof. Armand of Paris. Dr. Peiser shows by an ingenious method that the Assyrians followed a fixed order in the arrangement of the numerous signs of which the cuneiform writing consists. The question is a very important one, and the value of Dr. Peiser's discovery would have been still further enhanced, had he succeeded in finding some fixed principle in the succession of the signs. He believes the order to be based on mere graphical resemblances; but there are many difficulties in the way of this supposition. It is possible that, by reverting to a more ancient form of the cuneiform signs, a clearer connection between the signs that are placed in juxtaposition will become apparent.

Prof. Armand's article furnishes an interesting chapter on the history of "learned errors." Some years ago an inscription in cuneiform characters, and purporting to come from Cappadocia, fell into the hands of Prof. Sayce, the eminent English philologist, who expended a great deal of ingenuity in trying to decipher it. He gave two translations, one in 1881 and one a year later. The second was an improvement upon the first as far as the number of deciphered words went, but certainly no improvement as far as the sense of the inscription was concerned. Prof. Armand here shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that the inscription is the work of some "Shapeira," who clumsily tried to copy some cuneiform signs, and succeeded in so disfiguring them as to lead Prof. Sayce to suppose that he had a *new* form of cuneiform writing before him. The forger chose a short inscription found on the well-known bas-relief, coming from Kojundschik, and now in the British Museum, which represents Sennacherib sitting on his throne at Lachish in the act of receiving tribute. Above the head of the king are three lines of Assyrian, reading as follows:—

"Sennacherib the king of the legions, the king of Assyria, sits on the royal throne and receives the booty of the city of Lakis."

The inscription is one of the best known, so that it was not difficult for Prof. Armand, once having found the clue, to complete his happy "guess." Prof. Sayce is too great a scholar to feel chagrined at the error into which he has fallen, and will, no doubt, join in the hearty laugh which scholars are having at his expense. Prof. Chwolson was led astray by Firkowitsch, Prof. Socin by Shapeira's famous "Moabite Potteries," and Prof. Sayce will surely not close the phalanx of great scholars who have been the victims of great forgers. M. Clermont-Ganneau of Paris published, about a year ago, a little book on the "Frauds Archeologiques en Palestine," from which many will learn with surprise on how great a scale the manufacture of "antiquities" is carried on in the Orient.

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.

Philadelphia.

PRÆTORIUS' GRAMMATICA ÆTHIOPICA.*

This little grammar is No. VII. in the "Porta Linguarum Orientalium" series, begun by Petermann and, since his death, carried on under the editorship of Strack, of Berlin.

* GRAMMATICA ÆTHIOPICA cum paradigmatis, literatura, chrestomathia, et glossario scripsit Dr. F. Prætorius, Prof. ord. universitatis wratislaviensis. 1886. Karlsruhe & Leipzig: H. Reuther. Price, M.6.—

It is gratifying to learn that there is a demand among students for an *elementary* Ethiopic grammar. It certainly adds still further evidence to the fact that a new and deep interest in Semitic philology is spreading over Europe and America.

Since the publication of Dillmann's "*Æthiopische Grammatik*" in 1857, very little has been done in Ethiopic grammar. With the exception of König's "*Neue Studien über Schrift, Aussprache und allgemeine Formenlehre des Æthiopischen*," published in 1877, nothing of importance has appeared. Dillmann's grammar has remained heretofore and will still remain the authority. The "*Grammatica Æthiopica*" cannot, in any sense of the term, be regarded as a rival of Dillmann's. The book does not claim to be critical or exhaustive. The author has given us, in a condensed form, the *essential elements* of the Ethiopic grammar. He has presented, in a clear and precise manner, and in as little space as possible, the necessary points of the grammar. One thing worthy of notice is the transliteration in Roman letters of the greater part of the Ethiopic words used in the text of the grammar. This is done in almost every case where any difficulty of pronunciation might present itself to the beginner.

Besides the grammar proper, there is given a full list of paradigms (pp. 1-18); a Bibliography (pp. 19-28); a Chrestomathy, containing the first four chapters of Genesis, taken from Dillmann's *Ochtateuch*, and several other small selections (pp. 29-45); and lastly a Glossary to the Chrestomathy (pp. 49-65).

It is a matter of regret that the author did not present us with an English, instead of a Latin, translation; for, as Dillmann remarks in the preface to his grammar, the latter language appears quite pedantic in an elementary text-book.

ROBERT F. HARPER,

New Haven, Conn.

NEUBAUER'S CATALOGUE OF HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS.*

Hebrew bibliography is of comparatively modern date; but it has already attained to a high degree of perfection. Comparing the earliest and the latest Hebrew bibliographical works, we notice among the former the *Sifthe-yeshenim*, of Sabathai ben Joseph (Amst. 1680), with about 2,360 titles; while in the *Ozar ha-shorashim*, of J. A. Benjacob (Wilna, 1880), their number has risen to 17,000. This great progress is mainly due to the exertions of trustees and managers of public libraries in collecting literary treasures and in making their contents known to scholars and students at home and abroad by the publication of descriptive catalogues. The Bodleian Library excels in both these respects. It possesses the best collection of Hebrew works and the best catalogues. The Bodleian includes no less than fourteen distinct collections of Hebrew MSS., foremost among them being the Hebrew Library founded by Rabbi David Oppenheimer of Prague (1707). This Rabbi was the first among the Jews to collect books and MSS. systematically. He had a list of *desiderata* prepared, and employed agents to travel in all directions in search of rare and interesting works. His library was, however, moved from place to place; for a long time it lay at Hamburg stored away in boxes, hidden from the sight of man. No Mecaenas or institution was found on the Continent rich and liberal enough to rescue it out of the darkness. The Bodleian has

* CATALOGUE OF THE HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS IN THE BODLEIAN LIBRARY AND IN THE COLLEGE LIBRARIES OF OXFORD. Compiled by Ad. Neubauer. With Forty Facsimiles. Oxford: Clarendon Press.